

Remarks

Claims 1-21 are now pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 9, 14-16, 18, 19 and 21 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Applicants submit herewith one sheet of corrected drawings in which Applicant has added the legend "Prior Art" to Fig. 1. Applicants respectfully request entry of the corrected drawings and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,125,715 to Nissfolk. The Examiner rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nissfolk. The Examiner rejected claims 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nissfolk.

Nissfolk does not disclose the invention recited in claim 1 since, among other things, Nissfolk does not disclose an industrial robot that includes a cable secured to one connection/securing point and releasable secured to a second connection/securing point and extending between the two connection/securing points through an internal cavity. The Examiner asserts that sealing components 55 and 56 are a first contact/securing point. Claim 1 recites connection/securing points arranged on the first and second contact points. Nissfolk discloses that the sealing components 55 and 56 are arranged on the cables or possibly on separation

element 51, not the "first part" identified by the Examiner as assembly 6. Additionally, the sealing components 55 and 56 are described as sealing around the cable. Sealing is different from securing or connecting. Nissfolk does not disclose that the cables are secured in the sealing components 55 and 56.

Additionally, Nissfolk discloses that the cables are clamped within the "cavity" 37, 49, and 51 identified by the Examiner by tensioning straps at openings 46 in element 42. openings 46 are arranged rather centrally in the "cavity" identified by the Examiner. Therefore, the cables do not extend freely through the "cavity". As described in the specification, it is important for the cable to extend freely with the cavity to permit the robot parts to move relative to each other.

Additionally, Nissfolk et al. discloses that the cable is secured at a point 47 outside of the "internal cavity" 37 identified by the Examiner. Also, a separation element 51 is arranged between point 47 and the "internal cavity" 37. Additionally, Nissfolk discloses that the cable is secured with securing members 41 at a number of points in the "internal cavity" 37 between the point 47 and point 38, as shown in Figs. 4-6 and as described at col. 3, line 60, through col. 4, line 11.

Nissolk discloses a structure in which the cable needs to be threaded through the structure and attached at multiple locations. Additionally, the separation element must be affixed to the inner walls of the assembly. Disassembly of the structure disclosed by Nissfolk is also complicated and time consuming. All of these elements result in a structure that leads to longer maintenance and repair times, thereby decreasing productivity and increasing production costs.

The claimed invention avoids all of these problems by including a first contact/securing point and a second contact/securing point located in an internal cavity or a length of cable that extends freely through the internal cavity from the first contact/securing point to the second contact/securing point. The claimed invention is simpler and less expensive. Changing out a cable or a part of a cable may be quickly and easily carried out.

In view of the above, Nissfolk does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1-5 and 8-20. Since Nissfolk does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1-5 and 8-20, the invention recited in claims 1-5 and 8-20 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) no difference may exist between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure. *See Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q. 841 (C.A.F.C. 1984).

Along these lines, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a cited reference, of each and every recitation, as set forth in the claims. *See Hodosh v. Block Drug Co.*, 229 U.S.P.Q. 182 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Nissfolk does not suggest the invention recited in claims 6 and 7 since, among other things, Nissfolk does not suggest an industrial robot that includes a cable secured to one connection/securing point and releasable secured to a second connection/securing point and

extending between the two connection/securing points through an internal cavity. Whether or not Nissfolk suggests an electric motor, Nissfolk does not suggest the structure of the industrial robot recited in claim 1, from which claim 6 depends. Additionally, Nissfolk does not suggest an internal cavity as recited in claim 1 or an excess of cable extending between a first cable connection/securing point to a second cable connection/securing point within an internal cavity. Therefore, Nissfolk does not suggest the invention recited in claims 6 and 7 and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Nissfolk does not suggest the invention recited in claims 8-13 since, among other things, Nissfolk does not suggest an industrial robot that includes a first cable connection/securing point and a second cable connection/securing point located in an internal cavity or a length of cable that extends freely through the internal cavity from the first cable connection/securing point to the second cable connection/securing point. Therefore, Nissfolk does not suggest a method of connecting at least part of at least one cable between a first part and a second part of an industrial robot as recited in claim 8 or claims 9-13, which depend from claim 8, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Furthermore, a disadvantage of the structure suggested by Nissfolk is that the structure requires a space for the cable and a contact behind the motor. Embodiments of the claimed invention can eliminate the need for such a space. As a result, a corresponding space in a structure according to embodiments of the claimed invention can be used, for example, to house a larger motor, which may be desirable. Alternatively, rather than increasing a size of the motor, the tilt housing could be made smaller and more compact. Additionally, embodiments of the

claimed invention provide the possibility to have a contact on "top of the motor". This can make the contact easily accessible.

In view of the above, the reference relied upon in the office action does not disclose or suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the reference relied upon in the office action does not anticipate the claimed invention or make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited reference.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 8, 2009

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936